UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,064	07/31/2003	Deanna Lynn Quigg Brown	AUS920030444US1	3520

46073 7590 02/02/2007

IBM CORPORATION (VE)
C/O VOLEL EMILE
P. O. BOX 162485
AUSTIN, TX 78716

EXAMINER	
FEARER, MARK D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2109	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,064	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark D. Fearer	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *July 31, 2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement submitted on 31July2003 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Banga et al (US patent 6894976).

Consider claim 1. Banga et al. clearly shows and discloses a method of reducing data corruption due to recycled Internet Protocol (IP) identification numbers ("Then, if the two datagrams share a common IP identification number due to wraparound of the sending station's IP identification number counter, the receiving station can misassemble the data fragments. This misassembly can result in corruption of the datagram." column 2 lines 13-18) comprising the steps of: determining whether packets

are to be divided into fragments ("For example, if a size of the datagram exceeds the physical link's maximum transfer unit (MTU), that datagram must be fragmented ..." column 1 lines 33-35); determining, if packets are to be divided into fragments, whether IP identification numbers are being recycled ("A rate is determined at which an IP identification number generator associated with the receiving station wraps around." abstract); and setting a size of a first fragment of a packet to a maximum transmission unit (MTU) ("...that datagram must be fragmented into plural IP data fragments with sizes that do not exceed the MTU." column 6 lines 50-51), if the IP identification numbers are recycling and decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet each time the IP identification numbers recycle ("Thus, data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes." column 7 lines 49-50).

Consider claim 9. Banga et al. clearly shows and discloses a computer program product on a computer readable medium for reducing data corruption due to recycled Internet Protocol (IP) identification numbers ("Then, if the two datagrams share a common IP identification number due to wraparound of the sending station's IP identification number counter, the receiving station can misassemble the data fragments. This misassembly can result in corruption of the datagram." column 2 lines 13-18) comprising: code means for determining whether packets are to be divided into fragments ("For example, if a size of the datagram exceeds the physical link's maximum transfer unit (MTU), that datagram must be fragmented ..." column 1 lines 33-35); code means for determining, if packets are to be divided into fragments, whether IP identification numbers are being recycled ("A rate is determined at which an IP

identification number generator associated with the receiving station wraps around." abstract); and code means for setting a size of a first fragment of a packet to a maximum transmission unit (MTU) if the IP identification numbers are recycling and decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet each time the IP identification numbers recycle ("Thus, data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes." column 7 lines 49-50) .

Consider claim 17. Banga et al. clearly shows and discloses a system for reducing data corruption due to recycled Internet Protocol (IP) identification numbers comprising: at least one storage system for storing code data; and at least one processor for processing the code data ("The invention also includes apparatuses such as sending and receiving stations configured to perform the foregoing methods, computer readable code by itself or embodied in a computer program product to cause a computer to perform the foregoing methods, and a memory storing information including instructions executable by a processor to perform the foregoing methods." column 4 lines 50-57) to determine whether packets are to be divided into fragments (column 1 lines 33-35), to determine, if packets are to be divided into fragments, whether IP identification numbers are being recycled, and to set a size of a first fragment of a packet to a maximum transmission unit (MTU) if the IP identification numbers are recycling and decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet each time the IP identification numbers recycle (column 2 lines 13-18, column 6 lines 50-51, and column 7 lines 49-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banga et al (US patent 6894976) in view of Chien et al. (US 6891832 B1).

Regarding claim 2, and as applied to claim 1 above, Banga et al. discloses a method wherein data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a method of setting a fragment size (FRAG_SIZE) equal to a minimum transmission unit. This reads on the claimed "...packet is decremented until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit." (column 8 lines 62 - 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of setting a fragment size equal to a minimum transmission unit as taught by Chein et al. with the ability for data fragments to have different sizes as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit.

Regarding claim 3, and as applied to claim 2 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., fails to disclose decrementing by one octet.

Examiner takes Official Notice that decrementing the size of a fragment by one octet is known in the art for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to decrement by one octet as known in the art in the method of Banga et al. and Chein et al. for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Regarding claim 4, and as applied to claim 3 above, Banga et al. discloses a method wherein data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it reaches minimum transmission unit..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach the fragment set to maximum transmission unit after it reaches minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a method of automatic and dynamic reconfiguration of fragmentation parameters. This reads on the claimed "...after being equal to the minimum transmission unit, the size of the first fragment is set to MTU..." (column 5 lines 10 - 15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of reconfiguration of fragmentation parameters as taught by Chein et al. with the variable fragment size as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of setting the fragment size to MTU the next time that the IP identification numbers recycle after the fragment has reached minimum transmission unit.

Regarding claim 10, and as applied to claim 9 above, Banga et al. discloses a computer program product that fragments the data of a single datagram received by a receiving station into different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size

of the first fragment of a packet..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a computer program product that sets a fragment size (FRAG_SIZE) equal to a minimum transmission unit. This reads on the claimed "...packet is decremented until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit." (column 8 lines 62 - 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product that sets fragment size equal to a minimum transmission unit as taught by Chein et al. with the ability for data fragments to have different sizes as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit.

Regarding claim 11, and as applied to claim 10 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., fails to disclose decrementing by one octet.

Examiner takes Official Notice that decrementing the size of a fragment by one octet is known in the art for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to decrement by one octet as known in the art in the method of Banga et al. and Chein et al. for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Regarding claim 12, and as applied to claim 11 above, Banga et al. discloses a computer program product wherein data fragments of a single datagram received by a

receiving station can have different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it reaches minimum transmission unit..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach the fragment set to maximum transmission unit after it reaches minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a computer program product that can automatically and dynamically reconfigure fragmentation parameters. This reads on the claimed "...after being equal to the minimum transmission unit, the size of the first fragment is set to MTU..." (column 5 lines 10 - 15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product capable of reconfiguring fragmentation parameters as taught by Chein et al. with the variable fragment size as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of setting the fragment size to MTU the next time that the IP identification numbers recycle after the fragment has reached minimum transmission unit.

Regarding claim 18, and as applied to claim 17 above, Banga et al. discloses a system wherein data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a system of setting a fragment size (FRAG_SIZE) equal to a minimum transmission unit. This reads on the claimed

"...packet is decremented until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit."

(column 8 lines 62 - 65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system that sets fragment size equal to a minimum transmission unit as taught by Chein et al. with the ability for data fragments to have different sizes as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it is equal to a predefined minimum transmission unit.

Regarding claim 19, and as applied to claim 18 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., fails to disclose decrementing by one octet.

Examiner takes Official Notice that decrementing the size of a fragment by one octet is known in the art for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to decrement by one octet as known in the art in the method of Banga et al. and Chein et al. for the purpose of reducing the size of a packet fragment.

Regarding claim 20, and as applied to claim 19 above, Banga et al. discloses a system wherein data fragments of a single datagram received by a receiving station can have different sizes. This reads on the claimed "...decrementing the size of the first fragment of a packet until it reaches minimum transmission unit..." (column 7 lines 49-50). However, Banga et al. fails to teach the fragment set to maximum transmission unit after it reaches minimum transmission unit. Chien et al. discloses a system of automatic

and dynamic reconfiguration of fragmentation parameters. This reads on the claimed "...after being equal to the minimum transmission unit, the size of the first fragment is set to MTU..." (column 5 lines 10 - 15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system of reconfiguration of fragmentation parameters as taught by Chein et al. with the variable fragment size as taught by Banga et al. for the purpose of setting the fragment size to MTU the next time that the IP identification numbers recycle after the fragment has reached minimum transmission unit.

Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banga et al (US patent 6894976) as modified by Chien et al. (US 6891832 B1) in further view of Payton (US 5737009 A).

Regarding claim 5, and as applied to claim 4 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., fails to teach that fragment offset is modified when a packet is decremented. In the same field of endeavor, Payton discloses a method in which in which the offsets in a sequence are changed. This reads on the claimed "...when the first fragment of a packet is decremented, the fragment offset of all other fragments of the packet is modified." (column 8 lines 53-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of fragment offset modification as taught by Payton with the variable fragment size as taught by Banga et

al., as modified by Chein et al., for the purpose of adjusting fragment offset size when the size of the fragment itself changes.

Regarding claim 13, and as applied to claim 12 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., fails to teach that fragment offset is modified when a packet is decremented. In the same field of endeavor, Payton discloses a computer program product to change the offset of fragments in sequence. This reads on the claimed "...when the first fragment of a packet is decremented, the fragment offset of all other fragments of the packet is modified." (column 8 lines 56-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product that modifies fragment offset as taught by Payton with the variable fragment size as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., for the purpose of adjusting fragment offset size when the size of the fragment itself changes.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banga et al (US patent 6894976) as modified by Chien et al. (US 6891832 B1) in further view of Payton (US 5737009 A) and in further view of Malagrino et al. (US 6714985 B1).

Regarding claim 6, and as applied to claim 5 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset is not consistent with each other, the packet is discarded. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses

a method in which the fragment offset is used as a variable to compare the current length of a packet with the total length of a packet and discarding the packet if there is inconsistency. This reads on the claimed "...if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is not consistent with each other, the packet is discarded." (column 11 lines 41-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of discarding a packet if the lengths of datagrams do not match as taught by Malagrino et al. with the modified fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further view of Payton, for the purpose of discarding a packet if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same but the fragment offset of a fragment is inconsistent.

Regarding claim 7, and as applied to claim 6 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset is consistent with each other, the packet is reassembled. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses a method in which the fragment offset is used as a variable to compare the current length of a packet with the total length of a packet and reassembling the packet if they are consistent. This reads on the claimed "...if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is consistent with each other, the packet is reassembled." (column 11 lines 41-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of reassembling a packet if the lengths of datagrams match as taught by Malagrino et al. with the modified fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further view of Payton, for the purpose of reassembling a packet if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is consistent.

Regarding claim 8, and as applied to claim 7 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that packets are discarded or reassembled by a receiving host. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses a method in accordance with the IEEE 802.1D standard to receive a data packet at a source port that originated from a sending entity and forward that packet to at least one destination port for transfer to a receiving entity. This reads on the claimed "...the packet is discarded or reassembled by a receiving host." (column 1 lines 33-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of discarding or reassembling a packet at a receiving host as taught by Malagrino et al. with variable fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further view of Payton, for the purpose of discarding or reassembling packets of varying size at a receiving station.

Regarding claim 14, and as applied to claim 13 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that if the IP identification

number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset is not consistent with each other, the packet is discarded. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses a computer program product that uses fragment offset as a variable to compare the current length of a packet with the total length of a packet and discarding the packet if there is inconsistency. This reads on the claimed "...if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is not consistent with each other, the packet is discarded." (column 11 lines 41-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product that discards a packet of the lengths of datagrams do not match as taught by Malagrino et al. with the modified fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further view of Payton, for the purpose of discarding a packet if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same but the fragment offset of a fragment is inconsistent.

Regarding claim 15, and as applied to claim 14 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset is consistent with each other, the packet is reassembled. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses a computer program product that uses the fragment offset as a variable to compare the current length of a packet with the total length of a packet and reassembling the packet if they are consistent. This reads on the claimed "...if the IP

identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is consistent with each other, the packet is reassembled." (column 11 lines 41-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product that reassembles a packet if the lengths of datagrams match as taught by Malagrino et al. with the modified fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further view of Payton, for the purpose of reassembling a packet if the IP identification number of all fragments is the same and the fragment offset of a fragment is consistent.

Regarding claim 16, and as applied to claim 15 above, Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., and further modified by Payton, fails to teach that packets are discarded or reassembled by a receiving host. In the same field of endeavor, Malagrino et al. discloses a computer program product in accordance with the IEEE 802.1D standard to receive a data packet at a source port that originated from a sending entity and forward that packet to at least one destination port for transfer to a receiving entity. This reads on the claimed "...the packet is discarded or reassembled by a receiving host." (column 1 lines 33-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer program product that discards or reassembles a packet at a receiving host as taught by Malagrino et al. with variable fragment offset as taught by Banga et al., as modified by Chein et al., in further

view of Payton, for the purpose of discarding or reassembling packets of varying size at a receiving station.

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Mark Fearer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1770. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Mark Fearer
M.D.F./mdf

January 11, 2007

RAFAEL PEREZ-GUTIERREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1/31/07